

FILED

OCT 01 2007

NOT FOR PUBLICATION
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

THAT HIN LIONG; et al.,

Petitioners,

v.

PETER D. KEISLER,** Acting Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 04-72707

Agency Nos. A95-406-907
A95-406-908

MEMORANDUM*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted September 24, 2007***

Before: CANBY, TASHIMA, and RAWLINSON, Circuit Judges.

That Hin Liong, and his wife, Man Fong Soeng, natives and citizens of
Indonesia, petition for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not
precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** Peter D. Keisler is substituted for his predecessor, Alberto R.
Gonzales, as Acting Attorney General of the United States, pursuant to Fed. R.
App. P. 43(c)(2).

*** This panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without
oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

summarily affirming an Immigration Judge's ("IJ") denial of their applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention Against Torture ("CAT").

We have jurisdiction pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1252. Reviewing for substantial evidence, *Ali v. Ashcroft*, 394 F.3d 780, 784 (9th Cir. 2005), we deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the IJ's finding that the harms Liong experienced did not amount to past persecution. *See Prasad v. INS*, 47 F.3d 336, 339-40 (9th Cir. 1995). Additionally, substantial evidence supports the IJ's finding that Liong does not have a well-founded fear of future persecution. *See Lolong v. Gonzales*, 484 F.3d 1173, 1181 (9th Cir. 2007) (en banc); *cf. Sael v. Ashcroft*, 386 F.3d 922, 927-29 (9th Cir. 2004).

Because Liong cannot meet the lower standard of eligibility for asylum, he has failed to show that he is entitled to withholding of removal. *See Prasad*, 47 F.3d at 340.

Substantial evidence supports the IJ's denial of CAT relief because Liong did not establish that it is more likely than not that he will be tortured in Indonesia. *See El Himri v. Ashcroft*, 378 F.3d 932, 938 (9th Cir. 2004).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.